

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in the instant application. Claims 1-26 have been rejected by the Examiner. Claim 10 has been amended. The Applicant submits that claims 1-26 are in condition for allowance and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections. No new matter has been entered.

Rejections Under 35 USC §102

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 10, and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0062262 to Vasconi et al. (hereinafter "Vasconi").

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the * * * claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 10, and 12-14 because Vasconi does not teach or suggest each and every element recited therein.

Vasconi discloses an information exchange system for use in a business-to-business network environment. With respect to claim 1, the Examiner states that Vasconi teaches "wherein said branding tool maps said branded information provided in said supplier subscription records to profile information provided in said customer profile records and transfers resulting targeted branded information to said customer system," citing paragraph [0028] in support. However, this portion of Vasconi *generally* discloses a "dynamic procurement trading environment 110" as well as a customer branded environment...with delegated and distributed administration of customer branded user pages which allows suppliers of goods and services to keep their own identify [sic] and to publish branded information on the system." The system of Vasconi does not implement these features using a mapping of information provided in supplier subscription records to information in customer profile records,

but instead uses an Asset Capacity Exchange system (Figure 11), which includes Asset Posting 1210 that enables asset owners “to enter asset information on a pre-defined form through a web interface [which] may be directly downloaded from the company’s asset management system” (paragraph [0067]). Another feature, Browsing/Search/Matching Against Requests 1230 *enables users to “search and browse all available assets on the Idle Asset database”* (paragraph [0071], emphasis added). By contrast, the *targeted* branded information recited in Applicant’s claim 1 is implemented using information provided in supplier subscription records which is mapped to profile information provided in customer profiles, whereby *resulting targeted branded information is transferred to said customer system, rather than made available by a search*, as taught by Vasconi. Thus, Vasconi is entirely devoid of performing any type of mapping of supplier subscription records to profile information contained in customer profile records. Such mapping produces branding information that is specifically targeted to a customer and which information is transferred to the customer system. For at least this reason, claim 1 is not anticipated by Vasconi.

Claim 10 has been amended to include a portion of the features recited in claim 1. Thus, no new matter has been entered by this amendment. Claim 10 includes features that are substantially similar to features provided in claim 1. For at least the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1, the Applicant submits that claim 10 is patentable over Vasconi.

Claims 2, 6, and 7 depend from what should be an allowable claim 1. Claims 12-14 depend from what should be an allowable claim 10. For at least these reasons, the Applicant submits that claims 2, 6, 7, and 12-14 are also patentable over Vasconi. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 USC §103

Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Vasconi in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0055911 to Guerreri. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Vasconi in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0138527 to Bell et al. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Vasconi in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0074424 issued to Giles et al. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Vasconi in

view of Official Notice. Claims 15-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Vasconi in view of Guerreri and further in view of Bell.

For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art; that the prior art relied upon, coupled with knowledge generally available in the art at the time of the invention, must contain some suggestion or incentive that would have motivated the skilled artisan to modify a reference or combined references; and that the proposed modification of the prior art must have had a reasonable expectation of success, determined from the vantage point of the skilled artisan at the time the invention was made. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970).

The Applicant respectfully traverses the outstanding rejections because the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Claims 3-5, 8, and 9 depend from what should be an allowable base claim. Claim 11 depends from what should be an allowable base claim. As indicated above with respect to claims 1 and 10, Vasconi does not teach or suggest each of features recited therein. Thus, the introduction of Guerreri, Bell, and Giles with respect to dependent claims 3-5, 8, 9, and 11, would not cure the deficiencies stated above regarding claims 1 and 10, from which these claims respectively depend. For at least these reasons, the Applicant submits that claims 3-5, 8, 9, and 11 are in condition for allowance.

Independent claims 15 and 21 recite features that are substantially similar to those recited in claims 1 and 10. For at least the reasons advanced above with respect to claim 1, the Applicant submits that Vasconi may not be properly relied upon in the outstanding rejections of claims 15 and 21. Thus, the introduction of Guerreri and Bell would not cure the aforementioned deficiencies. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that claims 15 and 21 are patentable over Vasconi in view of Guerreri and Bell. Claims 16-20 depend from what should be an allowable claim 15. Claims 22-26 depend from what should be an allowable claim 21. For at least these reasons, the Applicant submits that claims 16-20 and 22-26 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

CONCLUSION

No new matter has been entered and no additional fees are believed to be required. However, in the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP
Applicant's Attorney

By Marisa J. Dubuc
Marisa J. Dubuc
Reg. No. 46,673
Cantor Colburn LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Phone: (860) 286-2929
Fax: (860) 286-0115
Customer Service No. 22851

Date: February 8, 2007